COMMISSIONERS
JEFF HATCH-MILLER - Chairman
WILLIAM A. MUNDELL
MIKE GLEASON
KRISTIN K. MAYES
BARRY WONG



**BRIAN C. McNEIL Executive Director** 

## **ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION**

November 30, 2006

Mr. Thomas L. Mumaw Senior Attorney Pinnacle West Capital P.O. Box 53999, Mail Station 8695 Phoenix, Arizona 85072-3999

Re: Arizona Public Service Company – Motion to Amend Decision No. 68685 Docket No. E-01345A-06-0009

Dear Mr. Mumaw:

As you stated in your Motion to Amend Decision No. 68685 (Emergency Interim Rate Increase), the interim PSA adjustor of 7 mills, save any Commission action, is scheduled to expire on January 1, 2007. Prior to the Commission convening the ARS § 40-252 proceeding on December 8<sup>th</sup> to consider your Motion, I would like you to respond in writing to a number of questions aimed at building an evidentiary record that will aid us in our deliberations.

- What is APS' current balance in all PSA accounts for fuel and purchased power costs as of November 30, 2006?
- What is APS' total amount for 2006 fuel and purchased power costs (using an estimate for the month of December)?
- How much does APS estimate will be collected through the 4 mill PSA adjustor scheduled to commence on February 1, 2007?
- If the Commission decides to continue the interim PSA adjustor of 7 mills until a final Order in the general case rate is issued, what is APS' estimated balance in all PSA accounts for fuel and purchased power costs as of May 31, 2007?
- If the Commission takes no action to continue the interim PSA adjustor of 7 mills until a final Order in the general rate case is issued, what is APS' estimated balance in all PSA accounts for fuel and purchased power costs as of May 31, 2007?
- If the Commission takes no action to continue the interim PSA adjustor of 7 mills until a final Order in the general rate case is issued, what is the amount in interest charges that will accrue as of May 31, 2007?

• If the Commission decides to continue the interim PSA adjustor of 7 mills until a final Order in the general rate case is issued and an over-recovery results, does APS have a position on how the over collection could be addressed in the pending general rate case with respect to holding ratepayers harmless?

I look forward to your expeditious response to my questions.

Sincerely,

Jeff Hatch-Miller

Chairman

Cc: Parties to the Docket

Brian C. McNeil

Lyn Farmer

Chris Kempley

Ernest Johnson